UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,757	06/25/2001	John E. Ahern	B0410/7282D1	2885
22832 7590 04/21/2008 Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis LLP (FORMERLY KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON GRAHAM) STATE STREET FINANCIAL CENTER			EXAMINER	
			STIGELL, THEODORE J	
One Lincoln Str		LEK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA	BOSTON, MA 02111-2950		3763	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/888,757	AHERN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	THEODORE J. STIGELL	3763			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 Oc</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 20-32 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 20-32 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 30 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is no antecedent basis for the control mechanism. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 20-26 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy-Chutorian (5,925,012). Murphy discloses an apparatus (see at least Figures 4 and 5) capable of delivering and sequentially implanting one or more of a plurality of pellets (210) within the myocardial tissue comprising an elongate flexible catheter body (106) having a length and a flexibility sufficient to allow for transluminal delivery, a delivery chamber (106) coupled to the distal end of the catheter body and having space for carrying pellets and a port (118) for releasing the pellets, an actuator (212, 102, 220) coupled to the delivery chamber and capable of delivering the pellets through the port, the distal tip (117) of the chamber being sharp, further comprising a control mechanism coupled to the actuator (see column 17, line 45- column 18, line 10

Art Unit: 3763

for a disclosure of multiple control mechanisms), further including a steering mechanism (proximal end of the device) that could be used to turn the distal end of the device, wherein the delivery channel can hold multiple pellets of therapeutic agent, wherein the actuator includes a plunger (220), and wherein the delivery chamber has arcuate shape.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy-Chutorian (5,925,012) in view of Dragan (USPN 4,457,712). Murphy-Chutorian meets the claim limitations with respect to claim 20 above but fails to include the ratchet assembly of claim 27 and the threaded plunger of claim 28. Murphy does contemplate using multiple actuator configurations (see column 17, line 45- column 18, line 10).

However, Dragan discloses an injection device that include both the teaching of a plunger with ratchets and threads. See figures 6 and 17.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious by one skilled in the art to substitute the actuator of Murphy for the ratchet and threads as taught by Dragan. One skilled in the art would recognize that both threads and ratchets are designed to move the plunger from one end to another in order to dispense a material. The motivation for the substitution would have been in order to enhance the control of the movement of the plunger for dispensing the material.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THEODORE J. STIGELL whose telephone number is (571)272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/888,757 Page 5

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Theodore J Stigell/ Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Nicholas D Lucchesi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763